

REMARKS

Receipt of the Office action of March 28, 2008 is hereby acknowledged. In that action the Examiner: 1) rejects claims 1-4, 6-12, 16-17, and 22-27 as allegedly unpatentable over Horton (U.S. Pat. No. 5,969,770) in view of MacInnis et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,853,385); 2) rejects claim 5 as allegedly obvious over Horton, MacInnis and Chauvel et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,369,855) 3) rejects claim 13 as allegedly obvious over Horton, MacInnis and Yahav et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,057,909); and 4) rejects claims 14 and 15 as allegedly obvious over Horton, MacInnis and Callway et al. (Pub. No. 2003/0027517).

With this response, Applicants amend claims 1, 12 and 22. Applicants believe the pending claims are allowable over the art of record and respectfully request reconsideration.

III. ART-BASED REJECTIONS

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected as allegedly obvious over Horton and MacInnis. Applicants amend claim 1 to define over MacInnis's teaching of setting alpha values to indicate transparency.

MacInnis is directed to a video, audio and graphics decode, and composite display system. (MacInnis Title). In particular, MacInnis appears to disclose a graphics display system which includes blending of plurality of graphics images based on alpha values. (MacInnis Col. 46, lines 57-63). The alpha values are derived per pixel using three different methods such as an alpha value from a key, an alpha value from the Y component, and an alpha value from a lookup table. (MacInnis Col. 112, lines 16-23). In particular, the method for deriving alpha value from a key comprises comparing the color components of the pixel to a predefined value, and the alpha value for the pixel is set to 0 or 1 based on the comparison. (MacInnis Col. 112, lines 32-37). Similarly, the method for deriving alpha value from the Y component comprises determining if the value of Y component of the pixel is within a predetermined range, and setting the alpha value to 0 or 1 based on the determining. (MacInnis Col. 112, lines 47-53). Further, MacInnis teaches deriving a composite alpha value of all the pixels in the image after the graphics have been blended. (MacInnis Col. 7, lines 35-41). Thus, MacInnis appears to teach deriving alpha values per pixel by comparing either the color components of the pixel or the Y component of the pixel to a

predetermined value, and deriving the composite alpha value of all the pixels in the image based on the derived alpha values after blending the graphics.

Claim 1, by contrast, specifically recites, “weight factor proportional to a plurality of luminance values in the digital graphics object with each of the plurality of luminance values having a value indicating transparency.” Applicants respectfully submit that Horton and MacInnis fail teach or fairly suggest such a system. MacInnis teaches alpha values that indicate whether a pixel is transparent or opaque; but, MacInnis fails to teach a weight factor proportional to a number of luminance values indicating transparency. Thus, even if the teaching of Horton are precisely as the Office Action suggested (which the Applicant do not admit), Horton and MacInnis still fail to teach or fairly suggest **“weight factor proportional to a plurality of luminance values in the digital graphics object with each of the plurality of luminance values having a value indicating transparency.”**

Additionally, in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action dated March 28, 2008, the Office Action states “(… Y component having a value of zero indicates transparency and corresponds to one of the luminance value; Y component having a value other than zero indicates the pixel is opaque and corresponds to a different luminance value; thus ‘0’ or ‘any value other than zero’ corresponds to the plurality of luminance values that indicates transparency of the pixel).” Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has misinterpreted a single pixel having a luminance value that either indicates transparency or indicates non-transparency as a plurality of pixels in the object with a luminance value that indicates transparency. By contrast, claim 1 is directed to a weight factor that is proportional to a plurality of luminance values within the graphics object, where each of the luminance values has a value that indicates transparency.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and all claims which depend from claim 1 (claims 2-11), should be allowed.

B. Claim 12

Claim 12 stands rejected as allegedly obvious over Horton and MacInnis. Applicants amend claim 12 to define over MacInnis’s teaching of setting alpha values to indicate transparency.

Claim 12 specifically recites, “weight factor proportional to a plurality of luminance values in the digital graphics object with each of the plurality of luminance values that have a value that indicates transparency.” Applicants respectfully submit that Horton and MacInnis fail teach or fairly suggest such a system. MacInnis teaches alpha values that indicate whether a pixel is transparent or opaque; but, MacInnis fails to teach a weight factor proportional to a number of luminance values indicating transparency. Thus, even if the teaching of Horton are precisely as the Office Action suggested (which the Applicant do not admit), Horton and MacInnis still fail to teach or fairly suggest **“weight factor proportional to a plurality of luminance values in the digital graphics object with each of the plurality of luminance values that have a value that indicates transparency.”**

Additionally, in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action dated March 28, 2008, the Office Action states “(… Y component having a value of zero indicates transparency and corresponds to one of the luminance value; Y component having a value other than zero indicates the pixel is opaque and corresponds to a different luminance value; thus ‘0’ or ‘any value other than zero’ corresponds to the plurality of luminance values that indicates transparency of the pixel).” Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has misinterpreted a single pixel having a luminance value that either indicates transparency or indicates non-transparency as a plurality of pixels in the object with a luminance value that indicates transparency. By contrast, claim 1 is directed to a weight factor that is proportional to a plurality of luminance values within the graphics object, where each of the luminance values has a value that indicates transparency.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12, and all claims which depend from claim 12 (claims 13-17), should be allowed.

C. Claim 22

Claim 22 stands rejected as allegedly obvious over Horton and MacInnis. Applicants amend claim 22 to define over MacInnis’s teaching of setting alpha values to indicate transparency.

Claim 22 specifically recites, “weight factor proportional to a plurality of luminance values in the digital graphics object with each of the plurality of luminance values that have a value that indicates transparency.” Applicants respectfully submit that Horton and MacInnis fail teach or

fairly suggest such a system. MacInnis teaches alpha values that indicate whether a pixel is transparent or opaque; but, MacInnis fails to teach a weight factor proportional to a number of luminance values indicating transparency. Thus, even if the teaching of Horton are precisely as the Office Action suggested (which the Applicant do not admit), Horton and MacInnis still fail to teach or fairly suggest **“weight factor proportional to a plurality of luminance values in the digital graphics object with each of the plurality of luminance values that have a value that indicates transparency.”**

Additionally, in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action dated March 28, 2008, the Office Action states “(... Y component having a value of zero indicates transparency and corresponds to one of the luminance value; Y component having a value other than zero indicates the pixel is opaque and corresponds to a different luminance value; thus ‘0’ or ‘any value other than zero’ corresponds to the plurality of luminance values that indicates transparency of the pixel).” Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has misinterpreted a single pixel having a luminance value that either indicates transparency or indicates non-transparency as a plurality of pixels in the object with a luminance value that indicates transparency. By contrast, claim 1 is directed to a weight factor that is proportional to a plurality of luminance values within the graphics object, where each of the luminance values has a value that indicates transparency.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22, and all claims which depend from claim 22 (claims 23-27), should be allowed.

IV. CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution

Serial No.: 10/823,183
Response to Office Action Dated March 28, 2008
Amendment Dated June 11, 2008

of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to the Texas Instruments Incorporated's Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

/Utpal D. Shah/

Utpal D. Shah
PTO Reg. No. 60,047
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(512) 610-3410 (Phone)
(512) 610-3456 (Fax)
Agent for Applicants